

Appl. No. 10/582,037
Amendment dated May 28, 2010
Reply to Office Action of February 3, 2010

REMARKS

In the February 3, 2010 Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12 stand rejected in view of prior art, while claims 5 and 11 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the February 3, 2010 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 as indicated above. Also, claims 1-4 and 7-10 have been cancelled by the current Amendment. Thus, claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 are pending, with claims 5 and 11 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Applicants have basically amended the claims to accept the allowable subject matter. Thus, no new issues are raised by the foregoing Amendments. Accordingly, entrance of this Amendment and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraphs 2-12 of the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0157717 (Hong) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,516,406 (Gentry et al.), and claims 6 and 12 are rejected as being unpatentable over the Hong publication in view of the Gentry et al. patent and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,432,311 (Holtzberg et al.). In response, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-4 and 7-10 amended claims 6 and 12 to depend from allowable claims 5 and 11, respectively, as mentioned above. Accordingly, these rejections are now moot, and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

In paragraph 13 of the Office Action, claims 5 and 11 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. In response, Applicants have amended claims 5 and 11 to place them in independent form. Thus, independent claims 5 and 11 are believed to be allowable.

Also, Applicant have amended claims 6 and 12 to depend from allowable claims 5 and 11, respectively. Thus, dependent claims 6 and 12 are also now believed to be allowable.

Response to Arguments

The Response to Arguments in paragraphs 15-19 are generally considered moot in view of the above amendments. However, with respect to the Response to Arguments in paragraph 19, please note that Applicant have not changed the language “to change an opening/closing state of the reed valve” as suggested in the Office Action. Specifically, Applicants believe this language does not misstate Applicants’ invention. Moreover, the suggested language “to change an opening/closing behavior of the reed valve” may not be completely accurate. Thus, Applicants have not amended this language. Applicants note that the Office Action does not formally object to the language, and thus, the assertions in paragraph 19 appear to be merely preferences of the Office Action. In any case, the undersigned welcomes contact by the Examiner regarding this language, if the Examiner disagrees strongly with the above assertions. It does not appear that the Examiner strongly disagrees since the claims were not objected to for this language.

Appl. No. 10/582,037
Amendment dated May 28, 2010
Reply to Office Action of February 3, 2010

Prior Art Citation

In the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicants believe that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding this amendment, in particular, the Response to arguments paragraph 19 discussion above, please feel free to contact the undersigned for a brief Interview.

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick A. Hilsmier/
Patrick A. Hilsmier
Reg. No. 46,034

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: May 28, 2010

S:\05-MAY10-YTY\DK-US065119 Amendment (Applicants plural).doc